UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/073,281	02/13/2002	Junko Ami	219178US2RD	3511
22850 7590 03/21/2008 OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET			EXAMINER	
			SEFCHECK, GREGORY B	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2619	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/21/2008	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/073,281	AMI ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
GREGORY B. SEFCHECK	2619	

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address THE REPLY FILED 07 March 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.  1. ☑ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonmer	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonmer	
application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which pla application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Reference of Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following times applied to the continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following times applied to the continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following times applied to the continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following times applied to the continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	equest
periods:  a) The period for reply expires 3_months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.	later. In
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITH MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).	OWT NIH
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if time may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion fee or (2) as
NOTICE OF APPEAL	1-15
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). AMENDMENTS	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because	
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issue appeal; and/or	s for
(d) $\square$ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.	
NOTE: The proposed amendments would result in changes to the language of claim 3 that raise new issues as to be	<u>he</u>
interpretation taken in the Final Rejection filed 12/7/2007. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-32)	24).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancel non-allowable claim(s).	ing the
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:	on of
Claim(s) rejected: <u>3 and 4</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to prove showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).	
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because Continuation Sheet.	ıse:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. Other:	
/Wing F Chan/ /Gregory B Sefcheck/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2619 Examiner, Art Unit 2619 3/13/08	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are not convincing. The Examiner has reviewed all of the record and believes the rejections of claims 3 and 4 are proper.

Applicant contends Mikkonen does not disclose the flow handle 24 is utilized to map a logical channel to a respective connection handle, which in turn corresponds to a respective buffer. Applicant alleges there is no correspondence between buffers, logical channels and connection handles in Mikkonen.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. As shown in the rejection, Mikkonen clearly establishes a correspondence (or mapping) between a flow label and the physical connection to be used for transport data with that flow label. This meets the limitation of "specifying....one of multiple connection handles to respective logical channels. Further, Mikkonen shows that the flow label, as well as other items in a packet's header, is then associated with a particular buffer, meeting the buffer-connection handle correspondence limitations of the claims. The Examiner has properly shown how Mikkonen meets the claimed limitations, given their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the specification, but without reading limitations in from the specification. Applicant is encouraged to further amend the claims to specifically differentiate the claimed subject matter from Mikkonen and the other cited prior art.

3-13-2008